

25 September 1970

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Briefing Director of Logistic Staff Meeting on Status of Emergency Planning Program

1. At Jack Blake's invitation I was asked to attend his weekly staff meeting (24 September 1970) of Logistics Division and Branch Chiefs and brief them on our progress, current status, and future plans in the Emergency Relocation Program.

2. In introducing me to the group, Jack explained that what had triggered his request for a briefing, was a comment from [redacted] that he had learned "informally" that we had eliminated the [redacted] (Jack was concerned about what other "changes" have been made in our EP program that would effect the Logistics support responsibility to this program). Evidently [redacted] has been serving as the officer in charge of the Logistic's planning for this area and was "surprised" to learn that we have eliminated this facility from Agency emergency relocation planning. (Everyone agreed that it was a logical decision they were merely questioning if the decision had been formally made and if so when it would be formally announced).

3. I spent about 45 minutes with them reviewing the background that went into our 3 February study on Emergency Planning and the status of action taken on the recommendations which were approved in that memorandum. Significant points made by me during this briefing were as follows:

- A. Our decision to eliminate [redacted] as a "secondary" relocation site was based on information contained in a memorandum from [redacted] dated 18 December 1969. The DD/S was briefed (January 1970) on contents of [redacted] memo and the DD/S concurred in our recommendation that we abandon our outdated plans for use of this facility. There has been no "formal" paperwork in this, as it is intended that this be done by revising the HR's on Emergency Planning, deleting all reference to [redacted]. In this regard I reviewed the changes we are making in the five Agency regulations (explaining substantive changes in the draft of new regulations now in Security for initial coordination, see attachment).

STAT

STAT

STAT

- STAT
- B. Decisions to cut back on costs of maintaining equipment and supply inventory and tying up space [] exclusively for relocation program was made on two assumptions:

- STAT
- (1) Lacking funds to install a "hardened" site at [] it is unrealistic to assume this installation could ever provide a capability to support a relocation force in the event of a thermo-nuclear attack, hence it does not make sense to continue to fund even the current modest amount we have been spending to maintain these stocks and occupy space badly needed for current operations []
- STAT
- (2) Further it is unlikely that there would be any survivors of a surprise nuclear attack on Washington, so why spin our wheels on any relocation site program.

- C. The above notwithstanding we are obliged by President Executive Orders to maintain an emergency relocation plan and for this purpose [] will remain our "designated" relocation site for the 1200 man initial emergency relocation force and we will maintain a planning "framework" which we may or may not be able to implement depending on the severity of the crisis which would trigger a relocation situation. The \$64 question which I could not satisfactorily answer was: "Precisely what Logistic requirements for supplies, material, transportation, equipment, and manpower should be cranked into our planning framework?" I pointed out that the only certainty is that we will not obtain additional manpower or the money to develop detailed plans to establish and maintain inventories of equipment solely for relocation purposes. Nor can we expect any serious effort on the part of the various components to come up with "requirements" for support based on what their relocation mission might be [] [] tried unsuccessfully for 10 years to obtain this kind of information).
- STAT
- STAT

D. Consequently the only "guidelines" I could offer Logistics on their responsibilities for support of the relocation program were as follows:

- (1) They should base their housekeeping, and office supply planning on a relocation force of 1200 for 30 days (I offered to provide the position roster of the 1200) and develop general requirements upon which they can place prepositioned requisitions with the military for food and clothing; office supplies and equipment to come from existing stock levels [redacted] (may require slight increase in stock levels).
- (2) Printing Services Division -- earmark their supplies and equipment to go [redacted] from present inventories at the PSD plant. (Recognizing they do not have guidance they need on requirements and our difficulty in defining requirements).
- (3) Logistics will not be expected to develop detail and elaborate plans at this time.

E. I told Jack Blake that the DD/S had been briefed on this approach during the time the February study was being prepared and we had obtained his concurrence at that time. We intend to again review this general approach on relocation planning when we next brief the DD/S in late October on the overall Emergency Planning Program.

[redacted]
Deputy Chief
Support Services Staff

STAT

STAT

STAT

*File
Emergency Plan*